

Ober, Kaler, Grimes & Shriver

120 East Baltimore Street . Baltimore, MD 21202-1643 410-685-1120 / Fax 410-547-0699 www.ober.com

Royal W. Craig rwcraig@ober.com 410-347-7303

Offices In Maryland Washington, D.C. Virginia

,EV832997624US

TRANSMITTAL VIA EXPRESS MAIL:

To The Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

> U.S. Patent Application 09/976,481 for "SOFTWARE SYSTEM FOR Re: QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF SOCIAL SERVICES"; (from PPA 60/239,770 filed: October 12, 2000); Filed: October 12, 2001; Inventor: Stephen Butz.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed, please find the following:

- Amendment Under Rule 1.116 responsive to the Official Action dated 14 -1. December 2006 (12pp), including Appendix A: Replacement Abstract.
- 2. One (1) Notice of Appeal under 37 C.F.R. 1.17 (b)(small entity).
- 3. One (1) Request for Reconsideration (2pp).
- Our post card. Please date stamp and return. 4.

Please charge the appeal fee of \$250, and any additional or unanticipated fees to our Deposit Account 50-3391 (a duplicate copy of this charge authorization is attached.) Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Respectfully submitted,

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on March 14, 2007, one copy of the above-referenced documents were transmitted by Express Mail to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re U.S. Utility Patent Application of

Butz, Stephen Art Unit: 2163

Appln. No. 09/976,481 Examiner: Charles Edward Lu

Filed: 12 October 2001

For: SOFTWARE SYSTEM FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENT AND

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SOCIAL SERVICES

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

The Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231-5601

Sir:

In response to the final Office Action dated 14 December 2006 in the above-identified case, reconsideration is requested of the Examiner's decision to make the Official Action final. In the first official action the Examiner objected to the Abstract for a misspelling, and rejected the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kraftson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,581). Kraftson et al. '581 shows a computer system for acquiring, managing, analyzing, and summarizing patient clinical care information for physicians. In response Applicant corrected the Abstract and amended the claims very slightly to specify that the present system is not physician/patient system but "provides quantitative accountability for social services provided by a case worker to a client".

Application of: Butz, Stephen Appln. No. 09/976,481

Page 2

In this final Official Action the Examiner "maintained" his objection to the Abstract but

for a new reason (excessive word count), and now rejects the pending claims under 35 U.S.C.

102(e) and (a) as being anticipated by a newly-cited reference, namely Douglas et al (U.S. Patent

6,039,688). Douglas '688 suggests a system by which physicians can well-manage patients, just

as Kraftson. Clearly, Applicant's attempt to stress "social services provided by a case worker to

a client" had no impact and did not prompt this new rejection. Douglas et al is an entirely new

reference, and entirely new grounds for rejection of all pending claims and applicant should be

entitled to a full and fair opportunity to address the new ground for rejection. An Official Action

should not be made final if it includes a new ground of rejection not necessitated by Amendment

of the applicant. MPEP 706.07(a). The Examiner has not articulated how Applicant's

Amendment could have necessitated the new rejections, and Applicant contends that the record

reflects that it did not. Consequently, the Examiner's issuance of a final Official Action is

thought to be premature, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the finality of the rejection

be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Royal W. Craig/ Reg. No. 34,145

Ober|Kaler 120 East Baltimore Street Suite 800

Baltimore, MD 21202

- 2 -